

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 16 have been amended responsive to certain of the objections found in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Thus, antecedent basis has been provided for the latched state of Claim 14, and Claim 16 has been amended to refer to the vertical frame member. As to the remainder of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is respectfully traversed since the Office Action has not identified in what way the objected to phrases render the claim scope unclear to one skilled in the art familiar with the present specification. See MPEP 2173.02. Applicants consider that the meaning of these phrases would have been understood by one skilled in the art familiar with the present specification and, in the absence of an explanation of the basis for their alleged lack of clarity, respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP ‘776 in view of JP ‘007, and further in view of newly cited U.S. patent 5,351,737 (Hoshiyama). According to the Office Action, JP ‘776 discloses the claimed invention except for a wire adjusting mechanism and a securing endplate, which features are respectively taught in JP ‘007 and Hoshiyama. It is respectfully submitted, however, that this prior art fails to teach the claimed subject matter, particularly the claimed longitudinal sliding groove slidably housing the guide part and the adjusting member “and opening in a direction facing the screen.”

According to the invention, a wire adjusting mechanism comprises a guide part attached to the vertical frame member and an adjusting member capable of sliding along a longitudinal direction of the vertical frame member and being attached to the vertical frame member, wherein the wire is fixed to the guide part or adjusting member. The vertical frame member comprises a longitudinal sliding groove slidably housing the guide member and

adjusting member and opening in a direction facing the screen, wherein an elongated end plate of the screen is detachably mounted to the vertical frame member so as to cover the guide part and the adjusting member in the sliding groove. For example, referring to the non-limiting embodiment illustrated in the figures, a vertical frame member 12a includes a sliding groove 44 which houses an adjusting mechanism 30 including a guide part 31 and an adjusting member 32. *The sliding groove 44 opens in a direction facing the screen*, and an elongated end plate 11b of the screen is detachably mounted to the vertical frame member 12a so as to cover the sliding groove 44.

JP '776 is described on pages 1 and 2 of the specification and provides a sinker or weight whose movement is limited by a spring. However, the force of the wire cannot be easily adjusted. It is undisputed that there is no disclosure therein of a longitudinal sliding groove slidably housing a guide part and an adjusting member, and opening in a direction facing the screen.

JP '007 discloses a longitudinal sliding groove 75 (Figs. 4-5) accommodating an adjusting member. However, the longitudinal sliding groove 75 opens *in a direction away from the screen* (Fig. 3), and so JP '007 cannot overcome the shortcomings of JP '776 as to this feature.

Hoshiyama discloses a supporting member 14 to which the screen 13 is attached. The supporting member 14 is housed in a supporting portion 8 (Fig. 2). But this teaching is irrelevant to the claims since the supporting portion 8 does not house a guide part and an adjusting member of a wire adjusting mechanism, nor does the supporting member 14 cover the non-existent guide part and adjusting member. Thus, none of these references teaches "a longitudinal sliding groove *slidably housing the guide part and the adjusting member, and opening in a direction facing the screen*, and wherein the elongated endplate of the screen is

detachably mounted to the vertical frame member so as to cover the guide part and the adjusting member in the sliding groove" as is recited in Claim 9.

Dependent Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP '776 in view of JP '007 and Hoshiyama, and further in view of JP '068 which was cited to teach a latching mechanism. Nonetheless, JP '068 fails to overcome the shortcomings of JP '776, JP '007 and Hoshiyama with respect to Claim 9, and so the claims are believed to define over any of the cited prior art.

Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicit an early Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record